

Application No. 10/014,929

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 27, and 28 are amended, new claims 31-36 are added, and no claims are canceled.

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1 and 27 have been amended to recite that the composer is adapted to provide a plurality of list acceptance methodologies, wherein the plurality of list acceptance methodologies comprise manual entry via a user interface portion of the composer and automatic entry by a query-based system, and that each slide is automatically presented as at least a portion of a web page, in combination with the other elements recited in each respective claim. Claims 9 and 17 have been similarly amended. Support for the amendments to claim 1, 9, 17, and 27 can be found throughout the specification and drawings as filed, for example at page 16, lines 1-11; and page 17, line 17 – page 18, line 9; and page 21, line 16 – page 24, line 11. Claims 5 and 13 have been amended to recite that said list comprises at least one of horizontal navigation of a plurality of web sites unrelated to each other by a URL, vertical navigation of a plurality of related URLs within a web site, and item navigation of a plurality of URLs related as results of a query. Claims 21 and 28 have been similarly amended. Support for the amendments to claims 5, 13, 21, and 28 can also be found throughout the specification and drawings as filed, for example at page 21, line 16 – page 24, line 11. Therefore, no new matter has been added by the amendments to the claims.

Application No. 10/014,929

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,904,450 to King et al. (hereinafter “King”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,785 to Craig (hereinafter “Craig”). Insofar as the rejections apply to the amended claims, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amended claims 1 and 27 now recite that the composer is adapted to provide a plurality of list acceptance methodologies, wherein the plurality of list acceptance methodologies comprise manual entry via a user interface portion of the composer and automatic entry by a query-based system, and that each slide is automatically presented as at least a portion of a web page, in combination with the other elements recited in each respective claim. Amended claim 9 similarly recites the step of establishing a list of URLs in said composer by one of a plurality of list establishment methodologies, the plurality of list establishment methodologies comprising manual entry via a user interface portion of the composer and automatic entry by a query-based system, in combination with the other steps recited in the claim. Amended claim 17 similarly recites means for establishing a desired list of URLs comprising manual entry means for entering a desired list of URLs via a user interface and automatic entry means for automatically creating a desired list of URLs from a result of a query-based system, in combination with the other elements recited in the claims.

The present invention provides a user with a plurality of list formulation options. In manual entry, for example, a user may enter URLs by a keyboard or from an existing text file (refer, for example, to page 17, line 20 – page 18, line 1, of the present application as filed). In one example of automatic entry, the composer receives the list as the result of a search engine

Application No. 10/014,929

action or database query (refer, for example, to page 18, lines 1-4, and the GOOGLE search results example depicted in FIGS. 9-11). Additional manual, automatic, or other list formulation options also exist; refer, for example, to page 18, lines 7-9. The composer is therefore adapted to provide a plurality of list acceptance methodologies to better suit a site owner/developer or user's needs.

Neither Craig nor King teach or suggest a composer adapted to provide a plurality of list acceptance methodologies, wherein the plurality of list acceptance methodologies comprise manual entry via a user interface portion of the composer and automatic entry by a query-based system, as recited in part in each of amended claims 1 and 27 and similarly in amended claims 9 and 17. Craig teaches only that URLS are "designated by the instructor" (Craig, Abstract) by surfing the web, noting URLS, and collecting and storing the URLS as a single web document (Craig, column 4, lines 6-14). King teaches only that "generating site list 122 comprises specifying one or more URLS to be presented as a slideshow of sites to the user" (King, col. 13, lines 1-5). Neither King nor Craig teach or suggest a plurality of list acceptance methodologies.

Further, neither King nor Craig teach or suggest automatic entry by a query-based system. Refer again, for example, to page 18, lines 1-4; and page 23, line 5 – page 24, line 11, referencing the GOOGLE search results example depicted in FIGS. 9-11, of the present application as filed with respect to a query-based system. Automatic entry by a query-based system is recited in each of amended independent claims 1, 9, and 27, and similarly in amended claim 17.

Application No. 10/014,929

Therefore, claims 1, 9, 17, and 27 are allowable at least for these reasons. Remaining claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-26, and 28-30 variously depend from claims 1, 9, 17, and 27 and are allowable at least for the reasons set forth above.

New Claims

New claims 31 and 32 have been added to depend on claim 9. New claims 33 and 34 have been added to depend from claim 27. New claims 35 and 36 have been added to depend from claim 30, which depends from claim 27. Support for new claims 31-36 can be found throughout the specification as filed. Therefore, no new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 31-36, though not treated in the rejections but variously dependent on allowable independent claims 9 and 27, are allowable at least for the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,



Amy M. Salmela
Registration No. 55,910

Application No. 10/014,929

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thuent, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone: (612) 252-1538